

OXFORD PAMPHLETS
1914-1915

RUMANIA
HER HISTORY AND POLITICS

BY

D. MITRANY

Price Fourpence net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
HUMPHREY MILFORD
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW
NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE BOMBAY



RUMANIA: HER HISTORY AND POLITICS

INTRODUCTION

THE problem of the origin and formation of the Rumanian nation has always provided matter for keen disputation among historians, and the theories which have been advanced are widely divergent. Some of these discussions have been undertaken solely for political reasons, in which cases existing data prove conveniently adaptable. This elastic treatment of the historical data is facilitated by the fact that a long and most important period affecting the formation and the development of the Rumanian nation (270-1220) has bequeathed practically no contemporary evidence. By linking up, however, what is known antecedent to that period with the precise data available regarding the years following it, and by checking the inferred results with what little evidence exists respecting the obscure epoch of Rumanian history, it has been possible to reconstruct, almost to a certainty, the evolution of the Rumanians during the Middle Ages.

A discussion of the varying theories would be out of proportion with, and out of place in, this pamphlet. Nor is it possible to give to any extent a detailed description of the epic struggle which the Rumanians carried on for centuries against the Turks. We shall have to

deal, therefore, on broad lines with the historical facts —laying greater stress only upon the three fundamental epochs of Rumanian history: the formation of the Rumanian nation, its initial casting into a national polity (foundation of the Rumanian principalities), and its final evolution into the actual unitary State, and we shall then pass on to consider Rumania's present attitude.

FORMATION OF THE RUMANIAN NATION

About the fifth century B.C., when the population of the Balkan-Carpathian region consisted of various tribes belonging to the Indo-European family, the northern portion of the Balkan Peninsula was conquered by the Thracians and the Illyrians. The Thracians spread north and south, and a branch of their race, the Dacians, crossed the Danube. The latter established themselves on both sides of the Carpathian ranges, in the region which now comprises the provinces of Oltenia (Rumania), Banat, and Transylvania (Hungary). The Dacian empire expanded till its boundaries touched upon those of the Roman Empire. The Roman province of Moesia (between the Danube and the Balkans) fell before its armies, and the campaign that ensued was so successful that the Dacians were able to compel Rome to an alliance.

Two expeditions undertaken against Dacia by the Emperor Trajan (98-117) released Rome from these ignominious obligations, and brought Dacia under Roman rule (A.D. 106). Before his second expedition, Trajan threw over the Danube a stone bridge, the remains of which can still be seen at Turnu-Severin, a short distance below the point where the Danube enters Rumanian territory. Trajan celebrated his

victory by erecting at Adam Klissi (in the province of Dobrudja) the recently discovered *Tropaeum Trajani*, and in Rome the celebrated 'Trajan's Column', depicting in marble reliefs various episodes of the Dacian wars.

The new Roman province was limited to the regions originally inhabited by the Dacians, and a strong garrison, estimated by historians at 25,000 men, was left to guard it. Numerous colonists from all parts of the Roman Empire were brought here as settlers, and what remained of the Dacian population completely amalgamated with them. The new province quickly developed under the impulse of Roman civilization, of which numerous inscriptions and other archaeological remains are evidence. It soon became one of the most flourishing dependencies of the Roman Empire, and was often spoken of as *Dacia Felix*.

About a century and a half later hordes of barbarian invaders, coming from the north and east, began to sweep over the country. Under the strain of these incursions the Roman legions withdrew by degrees into Moesia, and in A.D. 271 Dacia was finally evacuated. But the colonists remained. Only a nomad population would retreat before an invading enemy; a settled population would give way and submit to the conquerors, or take refuge in the neighbouring woods and mountains until the danger had passed. This was the case with the Daco-Roman population, who retired into the Carpathians, and lived there forgotten of history.

The most powerful of these invaders were the Goths (271-375), who, coming from the shores of the Baltic, had shortly before settled north of the Black Sea. Not being accustomed to mountain life, they occupied

only the plains between the Carpathians and the Dniester. They had consequently but little intercourse with the Daco-Roman population, and the total absence, in the Rumanian language and in Rumanian place-names, of words of Gothic origin, indicates that their stay had no influence upon country or population. Material evidence of their occupation is afforded, however, by a number of articles made of gold found in 1837 at Petroasa (Moldavia), and now in the National Museum at Bucarest.

After the Goths came the Huns (375-453) under Attila, the Avars (566-799), both of Mongolian race, and the Gepidae (453-566) of Gothic race, all savage, bloodthirsty raiders, passing and re-passing over the Rumanian regions, pillaging and burning everything on their way. To avoid destruction, the Daco-Roman population withdrew more and more into the inaccessible wooded regions of the mountains, and as a result were in no wise influenced by contact with the invaders.

But with the coming of the Slavs, who settled in the Balkan Peninsula about the beginning of the seventh century, certain fundamental changes took place in the ethnical conditions prevailing on the Danube. The Rumanians were separated from the Romans, following the occupation of the Roman provinces between the Adriatic and the Black Sea by the Slavs, such part of the population as was not annihilated during the raids of the Avars being taken into captivity, or compelled to retire southwards towards modern Macedonia, and northwards towards the Dacian regions.

Parts of the Rumanian country became dependent upon the new State, founded between the Balkans and the Danube in 679 by the Bulgarians, a people of

Turanian origin, who formerly inhabited the regions north of the Black Sea between the Volga and the mouth of the Danube.

After the conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity (864) the Slovenian language was introduced into their Church, and afterwards also into the Church of the already politically dependent Rumanian provinces.¹ This finally severed the Daco-Rumanians from the Latin world. The former remained for a long time under Slav influence, the extent of which is shown by the large number of words of Slav origin contained in the Rumanian language, especially in geographical and agricultural terminology.

The coming of the Hungarians (a people of Mongolian race), about the end of the ninth century, put an end to the Bulgarian domination in Dacia. While a few of the existing Rumanian duchies were subdued by Stephen the Saint, the first King of Hungary (995-1038), the 'land of the Wlachs' (*Terra Blacorum*), in the south-eastern part of Transylvania, enjoyed under the Hungarian kings a certain degree of national autonomy. The Hungarian chroniclers speak of the Wlachs as 'former colonists of the Romans'. The ethnological influence of the Hungarians upon the Rumanian population has been practically nil. They found the Rumanian nation firmly established, race and language, and the latter remained pure of Magyarisms, even in Transylvania. Indeed, it is easy to prove—and it is only what might

¹ The Rumanians south and north of the Danube embraced the Christian faith after its introduction into the Roman Empire by Constantine the Great (325), with Latin as religious language and their church organization under the rule of Rome. A Christian basilica, dating from that period, has been discovered by the Rumanian archaeologist Tocilescu at Adam Klissi (Dobrudja).

be expected, seeing that the Rumanians had attained a higher state of civilization than the Hungarian invaders—that the Hungarians were largely influenced by the Daco-Romans. They adopted Latin as their official language, they copied many of the institutions and customs of the Rumanians, and recruited a large number of their nobles from among the Rumanian nobility, which was already established on a feudal basis when the Hungarians arrived.

A great number of the Rumanian nobles and freemen were, however, inimical to the new masters, and migrated to the regions across the mountains. This the Hungarians used as a pretext for bringing parts of Rumania under their domination, and they were only prevented from further extending it by the coming of the Tartars (1241), the last people of Mongolian origin to harry these regions. The Hungarians maintained themselves, however, in the parts which they had already occupied until the latter were united into the principality of the 'Rumanian Land.'

To sum up: 'The Rumanians are living to-day where fifteen centuries ago their ancestors were living. The possession of the regions on the Lower Danube passed from one nation to another, but none has endangered the Rumanian nation as a national entity. "The water passes, the stones remain": the hordes of the migration period, detached from their native soil, disappeared as mist before the sun. But the native Roman element bent their heads while the storm passed over them, clinging to the old places until the advent of happier days, when they were able to stand up and stretch their limbs.'¹

¹ Traugott Tamm, *Über den Ursprung der Rumanen*, Bonn, 1891.

THE FOUNDATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE RUMANIAN PRINCIPALITIES

The first attempt to organize itself into a political entity was made by the Rumanian nation in the thirteenth century, when, under the impulse of the disaffected nobles coming from Hungary, the two principalities of 'Muntenia' (Mountain Land), commonly known as Wallachia and 'Moldavia', came into being. The existence of Rumanians on both sides of the Carpathians long before Wallachia was founded is corroborated by many contemporary chroniclers. We find evidence of it in as distant a source as the *History of the Mongols* of the Persian chronicler, Rashid Al-Din, who, describing the invasion of the Tartars, says: 'In the middle of spring (1240) the princes (Mongols or Tartars) crossed the mountains in order to enter the country of the Bulares (Bulgarians) and of the Bashguirds (Hungarians). Orda, who was marching to the right, passed through the country of the Haute (Olt), where Bazarambam met him with an army, but was beaten. Boudgek crossed the mountains to enter the Kara-Ulak, and defeated the Ulak (Wlach) people.'¹ Kara Ulak means Black Wallachia; Bazarambam is certainly the corrupted name of the Ban Bassarab, who ruled as vassal of Hungary over the province of Oltenia, and whose dynasty founded the Principality of Wallachia. The early history of this principality was marked by efforts to free it from Hungarian domination, a natural development of the desire for emancipation, which impelled the Rumanians to migrate from the subdued provinces in Hungary.

The foundation of Moldavia dates from after the

¹ Xenopol, *Histoire des Roumains*, Paris, 1896, i. 168.

retreat of the Tartars, who had occupied the country for a century (1241-1345). They were driven out by an expedition organized by the King of Hungary, in which the Rumanians from the province of Maramuresh also took part. It was the latter who then founded the Principality of Moldavia under the suzerainty of Hungary, the chroniclers mentioning as its first ruler the Voivod Dragosh.¹

The rudimentary political formations which already existed before the foundation of the principalities were swept away by the invasion of the Tartars, who destroyed all trace of constituted authority in the plains below the Carpathians. In consequence the immigrants from Transylvania did not encounter any resistance, and were even able to impose obedience upon the native population, though coming rather as refugees than as conquerors. These newcomers were mostly nobles (*boyards*). Their emigration deprived the masses of the Rumanian population of Transylvania of all moral and political support—especially as a part of the nobility had already been won over by their Hungarian masters—and with time the masses fell into servitude. On the other hand the immigrating nobles strengthened and secured the predominance of their class in the States which were to be founded. In both cases the situation of the peasantry became worse.

¹ The legend as to the foundation of Moldavia tells us that Dragosh, when hunting one day in the mountains, was pursuing a bison through the dense forest. Towards sunset, just when a successful shot from his bow had struck and killed the animal, he emerged at a point from which the whole panorama of Moldavia was unfolding before his astonished eyes. Deeply moved by the beauty of this fair country, he resolved to found a State there. It is in commemoration of this event that Moldavia bears the head of a wild bison in her coat of arms.

and we have curiously enough the same social fact brought about by apparently contrary causes.

Though the Rumanians seem to have contributed but little, up to the nineteenth century, to the advance of civilization, their part in European history is nevertheless a glorious one, and if less apparent, perhaps of more fundamental importance. By shedding their blood in the struggle against the Ottoman invasion, they, together with the other peoples of Oriental Europe, procured that security which alone made possible the development of western civilization. Their merit, like that of all with whom they fought, 'is not to have vanquished time and again the followers of Mohammed who always ended by gaining the upper hand, but rather to have resisted with unparalleled energy, perseverance, and bravery the terrible Ottoman invaders, making them pay for each step advanced such a heavy price, that their resources were drained, they were unable to carry on the fight, and thus their power came to an end'.¹

From the phalanx of Christian warriors stand out the names of a few who were the bravest of a time when bravery was common.

Mircea the Old, Prince of Wallachia, led the Rumanians in the battle of Kosovo, in 1389, when the united Balkan nations attempted for the first time to check the Ottoman invasion. The battle was lost, and Mircea had to consent to the payment of a tribute to the Turks. Nor were they more fortunate at Nicopoli, in 1395, where they fought with the army of Sigismond, King of Hungary, and were aided by a strong contingent of French cavaliers sent by Charles VI, King of France. Shortly afterwards, however, the Turks having invaded Wallachia, Mircea utterly defeated them at Rovine.

¹ Xenopol, op. cit., i. 266.

For a short time the country had peace, until it was again subdued by the Sultan Mohammed. In 1411 Wallachia had to submit once more to the payment of an annual tribute; but the country was otherwise kept free from any Turkish interference, and it was on this basis that the relations between Turkey and Rumania rested up to 1877.

After Mircea's death internal struggles for the throne racked Wallachia for nearly half a century. Some of the claimants having sought the assistance of the Turks in this strife, the latter made use of the circumstance by imposing upon Wallachia a yearly tribute of five hundred children for the corps of the Janissaries.

To do away with this obligation was the first thought of *Vlad the Impaler* (1458-62) when he acceded to the throne. Torn between the Ottoman oppression from without, and the moral corruption of his country from within, one may understand, and perhaps excuse the means of which this prince availed himself, impaling without hesitation all whom he suspected. But he was as fair in his judgements as he was cruel in his punishments, Vlad having impaled 2,000 Turks, sent to seize him by stratagem, Mohammed II himself led a punitive expedition against the Wallachian prince. Vlad projected no less a deed than the murder of the Sultan in his own tent. Speaking Turkish perfectly, he entered the Turkish camp at night with a few hundred of his men in disguise, penetrated to the tent in which he expected to find the Sultan, and killed the sentries and the Pasha he found there. The Turks, attributing the deed to some of their own soldiers, began a promiscuous massacre amongst themselves, which only ended at dawn. Vlad and his men, profiting by the confusion into which the Turks were thrown, crushed the Sultan's army completely.

An unfortunate feud, however, against the Prince of Moldavia, Stephen the Great, soon put an end to the reign of Vlad.

A period of the most lamentable decadence followed. During an interval of twenty-five years (1521-46) no less than eleven princes succeeded one another on the throne of Wallachia, whilst of the nineteen princes who ruled during the last three-quarters of the sixteenth century, only two died a natural death while still reigning. The Turkish domination prevailed more and more in the country. But it is worthy of note that even at the lowest ebb of their fortune, the Rumanian provinces never became what Hungary was for a century and a half, a Turkish province.

In Moldavia also internal struggles were weakening the country. Not being powerful enough to do away with one another, the various aspirants to the throne contented themselves with occupying and ruling over parts of the province. Between 1443-7 there were no less than three princes reigning simultaneously, whilst one of them, Peter III, lost and regained the throne three times.

But it was as if the country reawakened with the accession of *Stephen the Great* (1457-1504) to the throne of Moldavia. It was this prince who dealt the most serious blows to the Ottoman power. For forty-seven years he defended his country against innumerable enemies and, dying, he left Moldavia independent. Far spread the fame of his exploits. The Shah of Persia, Uzun Hasan, who was also fighting the Turks, offered him an alliance, urging him at the same time to induce all the Christian princes to unite with the Persians against the common foe. These princes, as well as Pope Sixtus IV, gave him great praise; but when Stephen asked

from them assistance in men and money he received none. He nevertheless succeeded in annihilating the Ottoman army at *Racora*, in 1475, which was considered the greatest victory that the Christians had ever before won over the Turks. The following year, however, the Sultan advanced at the head of 200,000 men against Moldavia. Having granted his peasant soldiers leave for a while to look after their homes, which had been devastated by a raid of the Tartars, Stephen was left with only 10,000 horsemen, with whom he entrenched himself in the clearing of a wood at *Rasboieni*. The Rumanians placed their wives and children in the middle of their camp, that their danger might inspire and sustain their courage in this desperate fight. But these men, the best of the Moldavian land, could do no more than die fighting, and it was only with a few of them that Stephen left the field and retired into Polonia. He rapidly organized a new army, harassed the Turks by continuous guerilla warfare, and finally crushed the Sultan's armies on the banks of the Danube. Not only was he refused all assistance by the neighbouring princes, but Vladislav, King of Hungary, conspired with his brother Albert, King of Polonia, to conquer and divide Moldavia between them. A Polonian army entered the country, but was utterly destroyed by Stephen in the forest of *Kosmin*.

With the death of Stephen the Great the period of struggle for the independence of Moldavia comes to an end. Having had enough opportunity to judge at its right value the friendship of the Christian princes, on his death-bed Stephen advised his son Bogdan to submit to the Turks of his own free will. Thus Moldavia, like Wallachia, came under Turkish suzerainty. Taking advantage of the ever-recurring rivalries for the throne,

the Turks exploited the Rumanian countries in the most shameless fashion, making the candidates to the throne pay enormous sums of money for their support. This money was usually borrowed, and once on the throne the princes impoverished the population by ever-increasing taxation. Tribute, as well as provisions, means of transport, and all kinds of services for the Turkish armies were exacted.

Nevertheless the Rumanians had not lost all consciousness of national strength, and they proved it when *John the Terrible*, nephew of Stephen the Great, succeeded to the throne in 1572. He refused to pay tribute to the Turks, and repeatedly defeated the Turkish forces. This greatly alarmed the Sultan, who ordered prayers to be said in all the mosques, whilst a new army of 100,000 men advanced against John. Anxious on account of the news which reached them, the soldiers of John asked him how many were their enemies. 'We shall count them on the battlefield,' was the reply. Unfortunately his cavalry, composed of nobles who were not over-loyal to a prince who defended the peasants, deserted to the enemy. John entrenched himself and would have been able to resist for a long time, save that he had no water. His soldiers spread pieces of linen over the dew-drenched grass to be able at least to moisten their lips, but in the end they had to surrender. The Turks tore the Rumanian prince to pieces and dipped their swords in his blood, that his courage and his gallantry might pass to them. Thus died the last hero of Moldavia.

The Rumanian provinces were suffocating, strangled by the bloodthirsty hands of the Turks. The reigns of John the Terrible and Michael the Brave were like the last convulsions of a struggling victim.

Michael the Brave, Prince of Wallachia (1593-1601),

taking advantage of the Turks being engaged in a war against the German Emperor, Rudolf II, and their vassal, Sigismund Bathori, Prince of Transylvania, crossed the Danube and ravaged the Turkish provinces up to the Balkans. As the Turks were relying on supplies from the Rumanian provinces, they were compelled for the time being to abandon hostilities against Germany, in order first to suppress the revolt in Wallachia. But the Sultan's armies were utterly crushed by the much smaller forces of Michael. A prince favourable to Turkey having then succeeded to the throne of Transylvania, Michael invaded and conquered this province, pushed further into Moldavia, and succeeded in bringing the three Rumanian countries under his rule. 'Prince of the whole land of Hungro-Wallachia, of Transylvania, and of Moldavia,' is the proud title inscribed in the documents of the period. Such deeds were not to the liking of the neighbouring princes, however, and intrigues ended in the assassination of Michael. 'It was not the Turkish sword which put an end to the exploits of Michael the Brave. The Magyars of Transylvania betrayed him: the German Emperor condemned him; and a Greek in Austria's service, General Basta, had him sabred: as though it were fated that all the enemies of the Rumanian race, the Magyar, the German, the Greek, should unite to dip their hands in the blood of the Latin hero.'¹ Michael only ruled for eight years. The union of the Rumanian lands which he realized did not last long: but it gave form and substance to the idea which was from that day onward to be the ideal of the Rumanian nation.

The fundamental cause of all the sufferings of the Rumanian principalities was the hybrid 'hereditary

Alfred Rambaud, *Introduction to Xenopol*, op. cit., I. xix.

'elective' system of succession to the throne, which prevailed also in most of the neighbouring countries. All members of the princely family were eligible for the succession; but the right of selecting among them lay with an assembly composed of the higher nobility and clergy. All was well if a prince left only one successor. But if there were several, even if natural children, claiming the right to rule, then each endeavoured to gain over the nobility with promises, and often even sought the support of neighbouring countries. This system rendered easier and hastened the establishment of Turkish domination; and corruption and intrigues, in which even the Sultan's harem had a share, became capital factors in the choice and election of the ruler.

Economically and intellectually all this was disastrous. The Rumanians were an agricultural people. The numerous class of small freeholders (*moshneni* and *razeshi*), not being able to pay the exorbitant taxes, often had their lands confiscated by the princes. Often, too, not being able to support themselves, they sold their property and their very selves to the big landowners. Nor did the nobles (*boyards*) fare better. Formerly free, quasi-feudal warriors, seeking fortune in reward for services rendered to their prince, they were often subjected to coercive treatment on his part now that the throne depended upon the goodwill of influential personages at Constantinople. Various civil offices were created at Court, either necessitated by the extension of the relations of the country or intended to satisfy some favourite of the prince. Sources of social position and great material benefit, these offices were coveted greedily by the boyards, and those who obtained none could only hope to cheat fortune by doing their best to undermine the position of the prince.

THE PHANARIOTE RULE

These offices very presently fell to the lot of the Phanariotes (Greek merchants and bankers inhabiting the quarter of Phanar) who had in some way or another assisted the princes to their thrones, these being now practically put up to auction in Constantinople. As a natural consequence of such a state of affairs the thoughts of the Rumanian princes turned to Russia as a possible supporter against Ottoman oppression. A formal alliance was entered into in 1711 with the Tsar Peter the Great, but a joint military action against the Turks failed, the Tsar returned to Russia, and the Porte threatened to transform Moldavia, in order to secure her against incipient Russian influence, into a Turkish province with a Pasha as administrator. The nobles were preparing to leave the country, and the people to retire into the mountains, as their ancestors had done in times of danger. It is not to be wondered at that, under the menace of losing their autonomy, the Rumanians welcomed the nomination of the Dragoman of the Porte, Nicholas Mavrocordato, though he was a Greek. The people greeted with joy the accession of the first Phanariote to the throne of the Principality of Moldavia¹² (1711).

Knowledge of foreign languages had enabled the Phanariotes to obtain important diplomatic positions at Constantinople, and they ended by acquiring the thrones of the Rumanian principalities as a recompense for their services. But they had to pay for it, and to make matters more profitable the Turks devised the ingenious method of transferring the princes from one province to another, each transference being considered

¹² Xenopol, *op. cit.*, ii. 138.

as a new nomination. From 1730 to 1741 the two reigning princes interchanged thrones in this way three times. They acquired the throne by gold, and they could only keep it by gold. All depended upon how much they were able to squeeze out of the country. The princes soon became past masters in the art of spoliation. They put taxes upon chimneys (*fumarit*), and the starving peasants pulled their cottages down and went to live in mountain caves; they taxed the animals (*vacarit*), and the peasants preferred to kill the few beasts they possessed. But this did not always help them much, for we are told that the Prince Constantin Mavrocordato, having prescribed a tax on domestic animals at a time when an epidemic had broken out amongst them, ordered the tax to be levied on the carcasses. 'The administrative régime during the Phanariote period was, in general, little else than organized brigandage,' says Xenopol.¹ In fact the Phanariote rule was instinct with corruption, luxury, and intrigue. Though individually some of them may not deserve blame, yet considering what the Phanariotes took out of the country, what they introduced into it, and to what extent they prevented its development, their era was the most calamitous in Rumanian history.

The war of 1768 between Russia and Turkey gave the former Power a vague protectorate over the Rumanian provinces. In 1774 Austria acquired from the Turks by false promises the northern part of Moldavia, the pleasant land of *Bucorina*. During the new conflict between Turkey and Russia, the Russian armies occupied and battened upon the Rumanian provinces for six years. Though they had again to abandon their intention of making the Danube the southern boundary of their

¹ Xenopol, *op. cit.*, ii. 308.

empire - to which Napoleon had agreed by the secret treaty with Tsar Alexander (Erfurt, September 27, 1808) - they obtained from Turkey the cession of Bessarabia (Treaty of Bucarest, May 28, 1812), together with that part of Moldavia lying between the Dniester and the Pruth, the Russians afterwards giving to the whole region the name of *Bessarabia*.

CONTEMPORARY PERIOD

In 1821 the Greek revolution striving to create an independent Greece broke out on Rumanian ground, supported by the princes of Moldavia and Muntenia. Of this support the Rumanians strongly disapproved, for, if successful, the movement would have strengthened the obnoxious Greek domination : if unsuccessful, the Turks were sure to take a terrible revenge for the assistance given by the Rumanian countries. The movement which was started about the same time by the ennobled peasant, *Tudor Vladimirescu*, for the emancipation of the lower classes, soon acquired, therefore, an anti-Greek tendency. Vladimirescu was assassinated at the instigation of the Greeks ; the latter were completely checked by the Turks, who, grown suspicious after the Greek rising and confronted with the energetic attitude of the Rumanian nobility, consented in 1822 to the nomination of two native boyards, Jonitza Sturdza and Gregory Ghica, recommended by their countrymen, as princes of Moldavia and Wallachia. The iniquitous system of 'the throne to the highest bidder' had come to an end.

The period which marks the decline of Greek influence in the Rumanian principalities also marks the growth of Russian influence. The first meant economic exploitation, the second was a serious menace to the very existence of the Rumanian nation.

The two provinces were again occupied by Russia at the outbreak of the conflict of 1828, and a provisory Russian government established. Though restored to Turkey by the Treaty of Adrianople (1829), the rights of the Porte being limited to the exaction of a monetary tribute, they remained under Russian occupation up to 1834, pending the payment of the war indemnity by Turkey. The assemblies of both provinces for the first time gave expression to the desire that the two countries should be united under a foreign prince, not belonging to any of the three neighbouring Powers. But this idea was quashed by the opposition of Russia, Turkey, and Austria, the strengthening of the Rumanian nation not being compatible with the designs of any one of these Powers.

Meanwhile a rapid intellectual development hastened the awakening of national consciousness. The sons of the nobility were sent to study in France, and the resultant contact with French civilization roused the sleeping Latin spirit, drowned in the flood of stranger influences. Western Europe also began to interest itself in this nation which had emerged from centuries of suffering and obscurity, more inspirited than ever. Political and literary events prepared the ground for this Rumanian *Renaissance*; and when in 1848 the great Revolution broke out, it spread at once over the Rumanian countries. The Rumanians of Transylvania rose against the tyranny of the Magyars; those of Moldavia and Wallachia against the oppressive influence of Russia. A joint action of Turkish and Russian forces soon checked the movement, and, as a result, the elective assemblies were abolished and replaced by Councils (*dirans*) nominated by the princes (Convention of Balta Liman, May 1, 1849).

The Treaty of Paris, March 30, 1856, reincorporated with Moldavia the southern part of Bessarabia, abolished the Russian protectorate, and maintained the suzerainty of the Sultan, who promised to give the two principalities an independent national administration. The representative of France, Count Walewsky, also put forward the question of the union. The idea being, however, strongly opposed by Turkey and Austria, it was decided to convene in both principalities special assemblies (*divans ad hoc*) representing all classes of the population: their wishes were to be embodied, by a European commission, in a report for the consideration of the Congress.

The idea of union was a nightmare to the Sublime Porte, and her commissary compiled the electoral lists in so arbitrary a manner, that it might once more have fallen through, had it not been for the invaluable assistance which the Emperor Napoleon gave the Rumanian countries. As Turkish policy was relying mainly on England's support, Napoleon brought about a personal meeting with Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, at Osborne (August 1857), the result of which was a compromise: Napoleon agreed to defer for the time being the idea of an effective union of the two principalities, England undertaking on the other hand to make the Porte cancel the previous elections, and proceed to new ones after revision of the electoral lists.

The assemblies which met after the new elections proclaimed that union, autonomy, and neutrality under a hereditary foreign dynasty were necessary to the welfare and reorganization of the Rumanian countries. These wishes were considered by a second Congress (Paris, May 1858); but three months of discussion and the sincere efforts of the French representative brought about no understanding on the point of the union. The

decision provided for a common legislation, a common army, a Central Committee composed of representatives of both assemblies for the discussion of common affairs, and a permanent alliance of the two countries under the name of 'The United Principalities'. But they were to continue to form two separate States, each with its own legislature, and each to elect for life a prince of Rumanian descent.

Though by no means wholly satisfied with this imperfect union, the Rumanians proceeded to the election of their rulers. Several candidates competed in Moldavia. To avoid a split vote the name of an outsider was put forward the day before the election, and on January 17, 1859, Colonel *Alexander John Cuza* was unanimously elected. In Wallachia the outlook was very uncertain when the Assembly met under great excitement on February 5.¹ A few patriots put forth and urged the election of Cuza, and the Assembly unanimously adopted this spirited suggestion.

Having realized that there was no hope of the Powers consulting anything but their own interest, by consciously and of set purpose hampering the emancipation of a long-suffering nation, the Rumanians had quietly accomplished by this master-stroke the reform which was an indispensable condition towards assuring a better future. Italy's military preparations prevented Austria from intervening, and two years later the new state of things was sanctioned by the Porte. The final step was taken in 1861, when the two principalities united under the name of 'Rumania', were given a common national assembly and a common government.

Cuza's reign was responsible for some reforms which

This date corresponds with January 24th, old style, when the union of the Principalities is celebrated in Rumania.

fundamentally transformed the social and political organization of the country. He secularized and turned into state property the domains of the monasteries, which, in Greek hands, had acquired one-fifth of the total area of the land (Law of December 13, 1863). Cuza then introduced the great reform which made the peasant tenants owners of the land they laboured on (Law of August 14, 1864). The Assembly having opposed this measure it was dissolved (May 2, 1864). Universal suffrage was introduced, but at the same time the power of the elective assembly was restricted by the creation of a 'Senate', which, composed of nominated members and members by right, was designed to exercise a moderating influence, thus, by its very nature, increasing the influence of the Crown. A whole series of laws followed, mostly adapted from the French laws, the most important being the Educational Act of 1864. It provided for gratuitous and obligatory elementary education, and for gratuitous education of all other degrees. Cuza also founded the Universities of Jassy (1860) and Bucarest (1864), as well as a large number of special and technical schools.

These reforms were unfortunately coupled with serious administrative and governmental evils. Organized and fostered by the Opposition, an anti-government plot led to the forced abdication of Cuza (February 23, 1866), and the prince left the country a few days later. No disturbance whatever took place, not one drop of blood was shed. Upon the very day of the abdication of Cuza the National Assembly proceeded to the election of a new prince, and the general desire being to have a ruler of foreign descent, the choice fell on Count Philip of Flanders, brother of the King of Belgium. The Porte protested at once against this selection, and as neither

France nor Russia was favourably disposed towards it. Count Philip considered it wise to refuse the offer.

Whilst a new Conference met in Paris, French circles put forward the candidature of Prince Carol of Hohenzollern (born April 20, 1839; died October 1914), which was also supported by England. A plebiscite showed the immense popularity of this candidature in Rumania, but on account of the opposition of Austria, Turkey, and Russia, the Paris Conference did not acquiesce in the selection, insisting that, in accordance with the decisions of 1858, the Prince should be of Rumanian descent. Nevertheless the National Assembly sanctioned the election of 'Carol I, Hereditary Prince of Rumania'.

Traveling incognito with a small suite, the prince second class, his suite first, Prince Carol descended the Danube on an Austrian steamer, and landed on May 8 at Turnu-Severin, the very place where, nearly eighteen centuries before, Emperor Trajan had alighted and founded the Rumanian nation. It was only after long and strenuous negotiations that the signatories of the Paris Convention recognized the election of Prince Carol, who visited in 1869 various European Courts in order to strengthen the external relations of his country. On his way back he became engaged, and was married on November 15, in Neuwied to Princess Elisabeth of Wied (born 1843).

Prince Carol came to the throne with the firm intention of freeing the country from Turkish suzerainty at the first opportunity. The majority of his Cabinet desired neutrality, and when it became clear, about 1875, that a conflict between Russia and Turkey was imminent, the Prince endeavoured to obtain from the Powers a guarantee of Rumanian neutrality. His *démarche* failed, and under the circumstances the only reasonable way was to come to terms with Russia for the purpose of

common action. The Convention of April 16, 1877, granted free passage under 'friendly conditions' to the Russian armies, Russia undertaking to respect the political rights as well as 'to maintain and defend the actual integrity of Rumania'. The participation of the Rumanian troops in the operations against Turkey was, however, not accepted. The Russian forces began the passage of the Pruth on April 24, and two days later the Turkish batteries across the Danube opened fire against the Rumanian towns. In consequence of this, the independence of Rumania was formally proclaimed on May 23, 1877.

The Russian armies having met with two serious defeats at Plevna, the co-operation of Rumania was persistently solicited, and Prince Carol was given the supreme command over the united forces before Plevna. After a glorious but terrible struggle, Plevna, followed at short intervals by other strongholds, fell, the peace preliminaries were signed, and Prince Carol returned to Bucarest at the head of his victorious army. Notwithstanding the flattering words in which the Tsar spoke of the Rumanian share in the success of the campaign, Russia did not admit that Rumania should take part in the Peace Conference. By the Treaty of San Stefano (March 3, 1878) Rumania's independence was recognized : Russia obtained from Turkey the Dobrudja and the delta of the Danube, reserving for herself the right to exchange these against Bessarabia. The Rumanian Government protested against this stipulation, and, having prepared to oppose an occupation of the province, Russia threatened 'to disarm' the Rumanian army ; to which Prince Carol replied that 'the Rumanian army may well be destroyed, but could never be disarmed'.

A Congress was summoned to Berlin to settle the

Eastern Question. Russia strongly opposed even the idea that the Rumanian delegates should be allowed to put their case before the Congress, and consent was obtained only with difficulty; after Lord Salisbury, England's representative, had ironically remarked that 'having heard the representative of Greece, which was claiming foreign provinces, it would be but fair to listen also to the representatives of a country which claimed only what was its own'. The incorporation of Bessarabia with Russia was nevertheless ratified by the Congress, on July 13, 1878. Rumania was deprived of a rich and fertile province, with a fundamentally Rumanian population, receiving in exchange a swamp, the sandy soil of which was hardly capable of cultivation, and the population of which was composed of Turks, Tartars, Bulgarians, and a handful of Rumanians. The Rumanians could do nothing but submit and console themselves with, and mark well, the words which Lord Beaconsfield sympathetically addressed to them, that 'in polities the best services are often rewarded with ingratitude'. Thence onward Rumania passed through a period of comparative quiet in her external relations. On the 10th (22nd) of May, 1881, the country was proclaimed a kingdom and upon the head of the first King of Rumania was placed a crown of steel made from one of the guns taken before Plevna from an enemy centuries old.

It may be interesting to note that after the abdication of Prince Alexander of Battenberg, in 1887, the Bulgarian throne was offered to King Carol. It is probable that the project was opposed both by Russia and by Austria; but Bucarest also wisely rejected it. The deep racial differences and the complete contrast in national ideas would have made an harmonious political union between the two peoples impossible.

In the absence of direct descendants and according to the constitution, the King's nephew, Prince Ferdinand of Hohenzollern (born 1865), was named Heir Apparent to the Rumanian throne. In 1892 he married Princess Marie of Coburg, and following the death of King Carol last year, he acceded to the throne as Ferdinand I.

HOME AND FOREIGN POLICY SINCE 1866

Prince Carol's task was no easy one. It was to rule over a nation which, attaining to freedom after many centuries of oppression, was prone to be carried away by an inexperienced enthusiasm for the liberal ideas of the time. The extremely liberal constitution of 1866, which resembled that of Belgium more than any other, reflected this spirit, and was rather the result of historical development than the natural outgrowth of social evolution. The ineptitude of a nation which, having at last won the right to speak aloud, believed that to clamour against anything that meant 'rule' was the only real and full assertion of liberty, and the laxity of a band of politicians bred upon Phanariote morality, hampered the efforts of the Prince, who, acclaimed a saviour when the country was groaning under foreign oppression, was now accused of enmity towards Latinism. This internal conflict became most acute at the outbreak of the Franco-German war, in 1870, when M. P. Carp, at the time Secretary for Foreign Affairs, declared in Parliament that 'where the Latin race is there also is our heart', and when the ill-considered behaviour of part of the population and of certain politicians nearly provoked Prince Carol to abdicate. Nothing but the sound patriotism of a few statesmen saved the country from what would have been a real misfortune.

The new era found the country partly lacking in

organization, or at the best fettered by obsolete institutions. Our politicians, it would seem, thought to attain Western civilization at a bound. But the pace was too rapid, the result was merely a veneer, thinly laid over the surface of national life. The most liberal institutions of the West were adopted without taking the general social condition of the country into consideration. A backward institution must of necessity follow the growing spirit of a community; a premature institution cannot possibly help a country to skip whole stages of natural development. It was as though a child were dressed in the clothes of a grown person and called a 'man'.

The bulk of the population, being completely illiterate, could not realize the rights and duties imposed by the new organization. They had to rely for enlightenment upon the upper classes, and these did not fail to let the peasant know his duties, though conveniently omitting to explain his rights. As the democratic Rumanian constitution abolished all titles of nobility, that harmless sop to the vanity of an immature society, the upper classes strove to secure posts in the new polity. They usually had neither interest in nor aptitude for these posts, which were generally obtained through bribery. The political field absorbed in this way all the greater land-owners, who formed the upper classes in Rumania, and they leased their lands to the best paying tenant. Rumanian leases as a rule are short (five to ten years), and the tenant has therefore no interest in introducing costly improvements into the existing archaic methods of agriculture.

Neither owner nor tenant has time to think of the peasant, nor can the latter do anything for himself, as he has no direct vote. Fifty of them send one delegate, having one vote, to the election which takes place in the

chief town of the district, and once there, the pressure of the authorities, which are organized completely on a political basis, or their generosity, induces the delegate to vote for the Government candidate. Although since 1904 the vote is secret, the influence of the administration is so effective, or the fear of it so great, that hardly any member of the Opposition would be elected at all but for the Government running no candidate in certain constituencies, so that it may not be deprived of a *pro forma* opposition.

A numerous army of officials forms the backbone of the political parties. Few offices only are permanent, even such as that of Postmaster-General changing with every Government. Their salaries are generally very small, so they have to redress this in one way or another. When in opposition they live precariously on party funds, until the necessity arises of replenishing their reserves, when they begin to attack the members and the policy of the Government, whatever it may be, in the most ruthless manner. Newspapers, public meetings, street demonstrations, all and every means are employed to force the Cabinet to resign.

To such conditions the 'two party' system was the most suitable, and, as it had support in high quarters, no third party was possible until recently, when M. Take Jonescu and his followers left the Conservatives in order to found the Conservative-Democratic party. The two old parties which alternately held the reins were the Liberal (founded by John Bratianu, whose son, M. John Bratianu, is its present leader) and the Conservative (founded by Lascăr Catargiu, now led by M. Alexandre Marghiloman). These descriptive titles mean, however, but little: Rumanian party policy is not based on political principles but political principles on party policy.

The Liberals, who include the majority of the big land-owners, are the real supporters of Conservative ideas. But the views held by a party upon a certain question often suffer fundamental changes when passing from opposition to power; and that such a thing should happen without the daily activities of the country being in the least affected clearly shows the hollowness of Rumanian polities. The officials are the class chiefly interested in polities, and the only change likely to affect them is the passing from opposition to power, or vice versa. A Rumanian political party has only one aspiration: to rule, and to rule alone. It may be mentioned as characteristic of the psychology of our parties that in 1888, after the defection of the Cabinet led by M. Carp, one of our ablest statesmen, and, what is more, one of the few who never bargained with his principles, only a small minority remained faithful to him, the majority of the Conservatives choosing as their leader G. Cantacuzino, whose only qualification was that of being the biggest landowner in Rumania.

This may explain, perhaps, how it is possible that, though much progress has been made, nothing has been done for the peasantry, four-fifths of the population of Rumania existing under conditions little different from those of the Daco-Romans. Mighty palaces have been built, but nothing has been done towards providing work for the peasant during the long winter months when he has nothing to do and less to eat.

Absorbed to some extent by the introduction of various reforms and largely by party disputes, the politicians were not able to devote themselves to shaping the national ideal. That Rumanians under foreign domination have maintained their nationality is due to purely intrinsic causes.

In Bucovina there are about 250,000 Rumanians. Formerly exposed to Germanization, they are now supported by the Germans against the rapidly expanding Ruthene element, the advance guard of Slavism.

Bessarabia contains about one million Rumanians almost all of the peasant class. Their Russification could only be effected by education; and, this being so, the reactionary attitude of the Russian Government towards education has enabled the Rumanian peasants to maintain their customs and their language.

In the Trans-Carpathian provinces, the cradle of the Rumanian nation, three and a half million Rumanians are constantly struggling for national existence. The great political ambitions of the Magyars are handicapped by their numerical inferiority, a handicap which can only be removed by oppressive measures taken at the expense of the other elements forming the heterogeneous population of Hungary.

As already mentioned, part of the Rumanian nobility of Hungary went over to the Magyars, the remainder emigrating over the mountains. Debarred from the support of the noble class, the Rumanian peasantry lost its state of autonomy, which changed to one of serfdom to the soil upon which they toiled. Desperate risings in 1324, 1437, 1514, 1600, 1784, tended to lift the economic oppression; that of 1848 aimed primarily at establishing a right to national existence. Transylvania was till then a separate Austrian duchy, but its incorporation with Hungary was now demanded by the Magyars, who had in their turn risen against Austrian domination. They proclaimed that without nationality life was useless; to lose the words of their national speech would mean also the loss of their soul. . . . Liberty, if lost, might be recovered; nationality would be lost

for ever'. But that the other nationalities within Hungary should use the same argument could not be admitted.

The Hungarian movement was defeated with the help of Russia (Villagos, 1849), who intervened in order to prevent the revolt spreading to Poland. Transylvania remained a separate duchy enjoying full political rights up to the establishment of the Dual Monarchy in 1867. With this date moral oppression set in. Hungarian was forcibly introduced into the administration, even in districts where the bulk of the population did not understand this language. The electoral regulations were drawn up in such a manner that the Rumanians from Transylvania, though ten times as numerous as the Magyars, send a far smaller number of representatives to the National Assembly than the latter. To quash all protest a special press law was introduced for Transylvania. But the Rumanian journalists being usually acquitted by the juries, a new regulation prescribed that press offences should be tried only at Kluj - the sole Transylvanian town with a predominating Hungarian population - a measure which was in fundamental contradiction to the principles of justice.¹

Protests have only resulted in an increase of the oppressive measures. And yet there should be union between Hungarians and Rumanians, since they are equally menaced by the growing Slavo-Tentonic pressure. But for this purpose it is absolutely necessary that the Hungarians should begin by changing their policy. The Rumanians cannot possibly try to avoid

¹ During a period of 22 years (1886-1908), 367 Rumanian journalists were charged. Together with those of other nationalities, the total number was 850, with a total of 216 years of imprisonment and fines amounting to Fcs. 138,000.

a distant danger by giving way to a nearer one: they cannot elect to die now in order that they may not die later.'¹

RUMANIA'S PRESENT ATTITUDE

The sufferings of Transylvania and the fact that she has given Rumania many great men in literature and science has kept alive and constantly intensified the interest which the Rumanians within the kingdom took in their brethren across the mountains. As a complementary element influencing Rumania's attitude may be mentioned the deep feeling caused by the loss of Bessarabia at a time when Rumanian national aspirations had taken definite shape. Hence from the material point of view, Rumania seemed to be equally interested in joining either one or the other of the parties now at war. But Rumania owes her present independence in a great measure to the support which France gave her in 1856 and 1858, while the intellectual influence since exercised by that nation upon the Rumanians is so intense, that the Rumanian historian Xenopol justly says that 'nous ne sommes qu'une reproduction plus ou moins fidèle de la civilisation française'. There could, therefore, never have been a question of Rumania joining Germany, unless she was forced to do so by some aggressive action of one of the Powers allied to France. The only possible question was: should Rumania go to war at all (and in this case it could assuredly be only on the side of the Allies), or should she remain neutral? Her attitude of hesitation is explained and justified by various considerations, which may be grouped, for the sake of clearness, as of the past, the present, and the future.

¹ Xenopol, *Les Roumains*, Paris, 1909.

PAST

A consequence of the seizure of Bessarabia in 1878 was to drive Rumania within the sphere of Austro-German influence, the more so as Prince Carol was of German origin and deeply attached to his native country, and was on terms of friendship with the old Emperor of Austria. But during the last Balkan conflict Austria failed to support Rumania diplomatically against the tergiversations of Bulgaria. Had Austria given such support the second Balkan war would probably have been averted, especially when it is remembered that Russia seriously urged Bulgaria not to initiate a conflict with her former allies. Now we know that Austria worked indeed, to a contrary end. Signor Giolitti has told the Italian Chamber that on August 9, 1913, the day after the signing of the Peace of Bucarest Austria intimated her intention of attacking Servia, and was only dissuaded by the influence of Italy and Germany.¹ On the same day on which this declaration was made M. Take Jonescu, the leader of the Conservative-Democratic party, and at the time of the Balkan wars Home Secretary for Rumania, disclosed that in May 1913 Austria's representative in Bucarest, Count Fürstenberg, was instructed to inform the Rumanian Government that Austria would intervene by force of arms in favour of Bulgaria, should the latter come into conflict with her former allies.² This was intended as a warning to Rumania, who had made it clear to Bulgaria that she would step in should such a conflict break out. The note conveying the above was read privately to a member of the Rumanian Cabinet, whose remarks were of such a character that Count

¹ *The Times*, December 3, 1914.

² *La Roumanie*, Bucarest, December 2, 1914.

Fürstenberg wisely refrained from officially presenting the note.

Austria's behaviour caused a complete change in Rumania's policy, as indicated by the visit of Prince Ferdinand—now King of Rumania to Petrograd, and the even more significant visit which the Tsar afterwards paid to the late King Carol at Constantza. However, when the war broke out, finding herself between two countries which had both, on different occasions, failed to prove their pretended friendship, Rumania could not reasonably have been expected to let sentiment influence her policy.

PRESENT

Under any circumstances these considerations alone would have carried weight. There are, however, others germane to the present situation; of these may be enumerated three, indicated inversely to their importance.

1. There is no doubt that any government would have hesitated before asking the late King Carol to go to war against his native country, especially as it was known that his days were numbered. This consideration no longer exists, but it was certainly of initial importance.

2. Since the Peace of Bucarest of 1913 relations between Rumania and Bulgaria had been somewhat strained, and Rumania naturally opened negotiations in order to satisfy and to secure herself as to the intentions of her southern neighbour. These negotiations yielded, it seems, no result. Bulgaria declared her intention to remain neutral, which, however, did not mean very much. Nevertheless it is probable that Bulgaria's attitude would not in itself have restrained Rumania. On the one hand Bulgaria could not yet have made good, even partially,

the enormous losses in men and war material incurred during the two Balkan wars, especially taking her precarious financial position into consideration ; and the Danube forms an obstacle which could only be forced by serious sacrifices in men and the aid of greatly superior artillery.¹ On the other hand action by Rumania would be of importance even though her armies were not sufficiently numerous to invade Hungary. An offensive-defensive movement on her part would of itself immobilize alongside the Carpathians an important portion of the Austro-Hungarian forces, the more so as the latter would be operating in a region almost completely inhabited by Rumanians, and by ill-treated Rumanians at that.

3. The most serious difficulty in the way of immediate action consisted in the lack of munitions. The artillery of Rumania has been entirely supplied by Krupp. In view of Rumania's doubtful attitude she can certainly no longer rely upon the same source, especially considering Germany's own pressing need. It is said that important quantities of war material destined for Rumania have been detained by Germany ; it is certain that this has been the case with a large contract for sanitary material for the Rumanian army.

THE FUTURE OF RUMANIA

It is interesting to note that the differences in Rumanian opinion have not followed party lines, which tends to show the sincerity of both sides. Those who advocate that Rumania should remain neutral, and they include

¹ Bulgaria's field army amounted to 300,000 men ; her losses in the Balkan wars (according to the Report of the Carnegie Balkan Enquiry Committee) were 44,892 killed, 104,584 wounded, and 7,824 disappeared.

some of our most eminent statesmen,¹ have not disclosed their mind. But I suppose that they consider, and, one must confess, not without right, that Rumania has no interest in seeing Russia completely successful. If Germany and Austria win, Russia will nevertheless remain a serious opponent of any effort Austria may make to bring under her domination parts of Rumania or of some Balkan state. But if the Allies win, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy will no doubt be dismembered, and Rumania will find herself in the not very enviable position of being tenderly squashed between the palm of the Slav and the fingers of the Magyar.

But further than this, one of the chief aims of Russian policy has always been the possession of the Dardanelles. Russia never was as near to its realization as she is now, when the Turkish Empire is a thing of the past, and when she has England as an ally, England who has always barred her way to the Golden Horn. Russia in Constantinople, however, means the economic strangulation of Rumania. Bulgaria has an outlet to the Aegean Sea, Serbia will no doubt have one to the Adriatic, Rumania depends entirely upon the Dardanelles. Her splendid position at the mouth of the Danube, her possessions on the Black Sea, will be of little worth with the mighty Empire of the Tsar dominating the Black Sea, the Sea of Marmora, and the Straits. Not only is the cheap waterway an absolute necessity for the bulky products, corn, petroleum, timber, which form the chief exports of Rumania; but these also form the chief exports of Russia, who, by a stroke of the pen, may rule Rumania completely out of competition.

¹ e. g. M. P. Carp, M. A. Marghiloman, and others are for neutrality, whereas M. N. Filipescu, another prominent Conservative, is, together with M. T. Jonescu, the chief advocate of military action.

Such a situation will ensure Rumania, no doubt, the full sympathy of the Western nations ; but no country would risk stepping in eventually for her sake, unless, as in the case of Belgium, vital interests of the Western Powers called for intervention. And such a case would certainly arise should Russia threaten the independence of Rumania.

It is the interest, therefore, and one may even say the duty, of the Western nations to favour the idea of a strong Rumania ; for this country, having served as bulwark to pagan Rome against the invasion of the barbarians, and bulwark to Christian Rome against the mounting tide of Turkish aggression, seems to be predestined by her geographical position to be for all time an advanced defence to Western civilization.

WHY WE ARE AT WAR

GREAT BRITAIN'S CASE

BY MEMBERS OF THE OXFORD FACULTY
OF MODERN HISTORY

E. BARKER.

H. W. C. DAVIS.

C. R. L. FLETCHER.

ARTHUR HASSALL.

L. G. WICKHAM LEGG.

F. MORGAN.

With an Appendix of Original Documents
including the Authorized English Translation
of the White Book issued by the
German Government

THIRD EDITION REVISED (ELEVENTH IMPRESSION)
CONTAINING THE RUSSIAN ORANGE BOOK AND
EXTRACTS FROM THE BELGIAN GREY BOOK

TRANSLATIONS INTO FRENCH ITALIAN SPANISH
GERMAN DANISH AND SWEDISH
ARE NOW READY

Paper Covers Two Shillings net (70 cents)
Cloth Two Shillings and Sixpence net (85 cents)

OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE BOMBAY

(a)